

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 RAJU T. DAHLSTROM,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

11 Defendants.
12

Case No. C16-1874RSL


ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT
METCALF'S MOTION TO
DISMISS AS MOOT

13 This matter comes before the Court on the "Motion to Dismiss Party Ronda Kaye
14 Metcalf." Dkt. # 61. On March 28, 2018, plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint
15 which substantively altered allegations against Metcalf, making clear that plaintiff is
16 asserting claims against her in her individual capacity. Although the Court disagrees with
17 plaintiff's contention that the filing of an amended complaint automatically moots a
18 pending motion to dismiss (Dkt. # 64 at 1-2), in the circumstances presented here, at least
19 some of the issues raised in the motion were impacted by the amendment. Metcalf offered
20 arguments in reply that appropriately addressed the new allegations of the Second
21 Amended Complaint but to which plaintiff had not opportunity to respond. The motion to
22 dismiss is therefore DENIED as moot.

23 Plaintiff filed two responses to Metcalf's motion. Multiple response memoranda
24 are not authorized by the local civil rules of this district. In addition, plaintiff's second,
25 lengthier response violated LCR 10(e)(1). The twenty-three page memorandum is single-
26

1 spaced in less than 12 point font. In addition, the number and length of footnotes was
2 excessive, triggering the Court's discretion under LCR 7(e)(6) to ignore the information
3 contained therein. In the future, memoranda that so clearly violate the rules of this district
4 will be stricken.

5
6 Dated this 4th day of May, 2018.

7 
8 Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge